

AL GORE and the now President-elect George W. Bush.

I think as Americans we were all honored by their statements last evening: A clear statement of vision and reconciliation on the part of the Vice President and, I have to imagine, the most difficult speech that gentleman has ever delivered in his life; at the same time, a speech from President-elect George W. Bush which I think demonstrated the full weight of understanding he has about his role as the President of our country—that he is President for all of the people. And that burden humbles him a great deal. We all look forward to working with him in the coming months and years as we continue to work in behalf of our country.

Certainly the prayer delivered by our Chaplain this morning clearly speaks to the concerns we have had and the wounds that must be bound and, of course, the actions that will be taken in behalf of leading this country.

I think all of us look forward to the opportunity of working with President George Bush in the coming days.

—
CONGRESSMAN JULIAN C. DIXON

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, the House is not in session because of the funeral of Congressman Julian Dixon.

Many here in the Senate did not know the Congressman, but I did. I had the great opportunity to serve with him in the most difficult of circumstances. We served on the Ethics Committee together during the period in which Jim Wright was examined for what was believed to be, and what was later found to be, unethical activities for which he finally resigned.

Julian Dixon was a fine American. Oh, yes, he was a partisan. But when it came to the responsibility of leadership, there was no question that his chairmanship of the Ethics Committee during that time was fair, equitable, and responsible. I must tell you that in working with him during those long hours and difficult times, I grew to respect him a great deal. I must say that we have lost a great public servant in the death of Congressman Julian Dixon. I will miss him. I think all of us will.

—
JULIAN DIXON

Mr. REID. Mr. President, before coming to the Senate, I was a member of the California congressional delegation. Even though I am from the State of Nevada, they allowed me to be part of their deliberations and, in fact, when I came here, I was secretary-treasurer of the California congressional delegation. As a result of that association, I got to know Julian Dixon very well. He was a fine man. He came to Nevada for me on a number of occasions. He was an outspoken advocate of doing good things for the District of Columbia. The District of Columbia lost a very powerful voice when Julian Dixon's heart stopped beating.

He also, as I indicated in my conversation with the Presiding Officer today, served very valiantly as a member of the Ethics Committee in the House of Representatives. In fact, the Presiding Officer served as a Member with him. In short, Julian Dixon, who was a great advocate for political causes throughout his entire political career, was a person who believed in the Congress. He believed in our form of government. His loss is a loss to our Nation. I extend my condolences to his entire family, recognizing that we lost a great patriot in Julian Dixon.

LESSONS FROM THE HAGUE

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, recently, I attended the Sixth Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (COP-6) at The Hague, in the Netherlands. I went to observe Undersecretary of State Frank Loy and the rest of the U.S. negotiating team confront the complex issues associated with the requirements of the 1997 Kyoto Protocol to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

The experience brought into clearer focus for me some disturbing themes that appear to be behind the intense international pressure brought to bear on the United States to reach agreement on some profound economic, social, and environmental issues.

At the outset, let me make clear that I did not arrive at The Hague without first studying the climate issue. For several years now, I have closely followed the progress of the climate change debate.

I have sought the input of nationally recognized scientists credentialed in the disciplines of atmospheric, ocean, and computer modeling sciences. I have reviewed scientific reports, most notably the document entitled *Research Pathways for the Next Decade*, prepared by scientists affiliated with the National Academy of Sciences Board on Atmospheric Sciences and Climate.

In addition, I have traveled to institutions such as the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute in Massachusetts and met with ocean scientists who are very involved in climate research.

All of these scientists have, for many years, studied and disagreed on how much our planet is warming, and whether it was driven by natural causes or by carbon dioxide emissions from industry, and other human activities.

Scientists from around the world have had legitimate disagreements on how drastic a problem global warming is likely to be in this century and beyond. The debate has been further complicated by politically motivated "junk science" predictions of "imminent" environmental catastrophes capitalizing on weather events that most scientists agree are not linked to current temperature increases.

The emotional intensity of this debate cautioned many policymakers not

to take sides early. However, as Republican Policy Committee Chairman, I felt compelled to address the many valid concerns expressed about this issue in a balanced way.

This led me to introduce with my colleagues, Senators MURKOWSKI, HAGEL, and others, over a year ago, comprehensive legislation that I believed, and still believe, provides the framework for some responsible and immediate consensus action on this issue.

A few days before leaving for The Hague, I met with the Director of the National Research Council's Board on Atmospheric Sciences and Climate, and other scientists on the Board to discuss the status of the scientific research on climate change. Prior to that date, the NRC was reluctant to agree with earlier summary scientific assessments of the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) that humans were contributing to increasing temperatures recorded around the globe—the so-called "anthropogenic effect."

Indeed, at a Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee hearing held just last Spring, Dr. Joe Friday, testifying on behalf of the NRC stated that the "jury is still out" on why global temperatures are rising. The NRC was clearly unable at that time to state on the record that it had detected clear evidence of an anthropogenic fingerprint on the warming trends of earth's climate.

At our meeting a few weeks ago, the NRC scientists were less passionate in their refusal to acknowledge the "anthropogenic effect." I took from our discussion that day that there was increasing evidence that land-use practices and human emissions of greenhouse gases were having some contributing effect to the increased land surface temperatures monitored around the globe.

To be sure, the scientists did not suggest or imply that temperatures would reach dangerously high levels during the next 50 to 100 years. Indeed, the scientists offered their opinion that the rise in temperature would more likely be closer to 1.5 degrees rather than the 5 to 10 degree high range predicted for later this century by the IPCC.

Moreover, the NRC scientists underscored the uncertain nature of the computer modeling results on which most, if not all, predictions depend. They cautioned against fully embracing any set of predictions because of the uncertain nature of input data and the ability of computers to fairly and adequately handle the many variables that are included in computer programs.

They further noted the need for continued technological advancement in super computer capability.

What was clear to me after that meeting was that the issue of human contributions to increasing temperatures was reaching some consensus within the National Academy of Sciences.